DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 800 EA 026 555

AUTHOR Walker, Doris McEwen
TITLE Preparation for Educational Leadership: A Collaborative Model Emerging in Indiana.
PUB DATE Feb 95
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (New Orleans, LA, February 11, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; College School Cooperation; Educational Administration; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Leadership Training; *Management Development; Partnerships in Education; Program Design; *Program Development
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana University South Bend

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the planning and design of an administrator-preparation program to be instituted at the Division of Education at Indiana University South Bend (IUSB) in the summer of 1995. The School Leadership Collaborative received a Lilly Endowment grant in 1993 to collaborate with four surrounding Indiana school corporations. The program is based on the premise that collaboration with school districts on curriculum design and an instructional delivery model based on problems of practice, cotaught with practitioners, will provide a more relevant program in educational leadership. The program addresses four major content areas--communications and interpersonal relations, knowledge of teaching and learning, community context, and leadership and organization. It utilizes Edwin Bridges' (Stanford University) problem-based learning model (PBL), in which students respond to simulated problems, and is based on guidelines of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1993). One table is included. Contains 21 references. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 800

Running head: PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Preparation for Educational Leadership: A Collaborative Model Emerging in Indiana

Doris McEwen Walker

Indiana University South Bend

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DORIS MCEWEN WALKER, PH.D.
INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTH BEND

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the 1995 American Association of School Administrators, Conference Within A Conference, Session #2D - Some New Perspectives on Collaborative Administrator Preparation, New Orleans, LA, February 11, 1995.

EA 026 555

AASA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Walker
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The Division of Education at Indiana University South Bend (IUSB) is in the planning stage of an exciting program to prepare aspiring principals for the challenges and rewards of leadership in today's schools. The School Leadership Collaborative, as it has come to be known at IUSB, is a result of reviewing past practice in the preparation of school administrators and addressing the criticism that past programs were not adequately preparing school leaders. As a result of a Lilly Endowment grant (1993) and in collaboration with four surrounding Indiana school corporations - South Bend Community Schools, The School City of Mishawaka, Penn-Harris-Madison Schools, and Elkhart Community Schools - a new program will be instituted beginning with the summer of 1995 to prepare school administrators for the excitement of educational leadership. The program premise is that collaboration with school districts on curriculum design and an instructional delivery based on problems of practice, co-taught with practitioners, will provide a more relevant program in educational leadership. The paper will present the IUSB model of educational leadership preparation. Included will be information on the development of the project from its initial stages to the present, including the dynamics of collaboration used in the model.

Preparation for Educational Leadership: A Collaborative Model Emerging in Indiana

"My school administration courses were just not relevant...I wish I had had courses that would have prepared me for the real world of being a school principal...I may need all of this theory stuff for intellectual reflection and discussion with colleagues, but how is it going to help me deal with the realities of day to day operations of a building." These comments are common among students completing post baccalaureate degrees in educational administration, certification programs for the principalship, and from persons who have become school principals. Superintendents lament that applicants are just not ready to deal with the realities of the principalship. While they have all of the state requirements necessary for certification and licensure, they lack the skills necessary to be effective as school principals. Their exposure to current issues facing school administrators is limited. They are not prepared to deal with diverse populations. Superintendents challenge universities and principal preparation programs to be proactive and creative in responding to the need to prepare school principals. They seek applicants with skills and vision, commitment and sensitivity, grounded in the realities of the principalship. They challenge the universities - who have major responsibility for setting the direction for preparation to address these issues - to respond to the criticism that is hurled at public schools by providing quality school leaders.

The building principal is the core of whether a school is successful. For many years the literature has espoused that effective schools are characterized by strong, capable instructional leadership. (Edmonds, 1979, 1980, 1983; Fredericks & Brown, 1993; Hannaway & Talbert,

1993; Lazotte, 1991) We have heard this so often and read it so much in the literature that it can be considered a cliché. The building principal provides the impetus for effective schools. American public schools remain the brunt of criticism. The public continues to express their dissatisfaction with education. Whether this is real or another way our society chooses to place the blame for universal social ills, schools remain in the forefront of public scrutiny. And schools, are only as successful as their leadership. Believing this, it is no wonder that the preparation of school administrators and specifically building principals have received quite a bit of attention. The preparation of principals is paramount to effective leadership. Educational administration programs throughout the country are assessing the effective of principal preparation programs. (Griffith, 1988; Smith-Stuart, 1989; McCall, 1994) Most of the reform has centered on providing an experiential core, believing that the more real the experiences for aspiring principals, the most effective these persons will be as principals. The reform has also centered on collaborations between university preparation programs and school districts on the anticipated needs of the district and how the two entities working together can provide a relevant training/certification program. (Murphy, 1993)

Indiana University South Bend (IUSB) is exploring these reforms and in the process of implementing a principal's certification program to address the issue of effective administrative preparation. A Lilly Endowment grant to the Division of Education at IUSB in the 1992-93 academic year provided the financial impetus for dialog on a revised principal's preparation program. The grant focus was on reflecting the most current professional thinking in preparation programs, as well as looking at ways to address diverse needs and a population becoming

increasingly multicultural by providing pre-service and in-service to improve administrative preparation. The initial grant was also to establish ongoing conversations with principals, superintendents, boards, professional organizations and the university community. These conversations led to the establishment of a working collaborative to serve as a vehicle for assessing school corporation needs in the area of administrative preparation and developing strategies to address these needs. The working collaborative between Indiana University South Bend and four area school corporations in Northern Indiana: The South Bend Community School Corporation, the Elkhart Community Schools, the School City of Mishawaka, and the Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation, determined that a new principal's certification program was needed, one that preserved the best practices of the current program yet was innovative in addressing administrative preparation.

The new principal's certification program is a cooperative effort between the university faculty and the area school corporations. Students will be admitted into a cohort program after completing an orientation course. Their admittance will be determined by a panel of practitioners and IUSB faculty. Their academic program will consist of completing six courses beyond the orientation course (a total of 24 semester credit hours). A major component of each course will be the students' involvement in consultant teams to work in school sites on problems of practice with building principals. The program design represents a significant departure from the collection of courses to meet state certification, which has been the norm at IUSB. Although a sequence of courses comprise the knowledge base for the new principal's certification program, the central thrust will be the immersion of students in actual problems faced by building principals

during each of the courses required for the program. The culminating experience for students will be the presentation of a portfolio as part of their exit interview. It is anticipated that the certification program will take two years and one term to complete. Students will begin during a summer term with an orientation course. They will select school law and communications courses during the first Fall term and a teaching and learning course during the Spring term. The following Fall, they will be expected to take a leadership and organization course, and conclude in the Spring with the community context of schooling and portfolio assessment courses.

Demographics

Indiana University South Bend (IUSB)

Indiana University South Bend, one of eight campuses of the Indiana University system, is located in South Bend, Indiana. Although each campus has its own unique character, all are connected by a sense of partnership in educational mission, and their curriculum is unified under the umbrella of the Indiana University system. (Bulletin, 1994-96, p. 7) A comprehensive university offering more than 100 academic programs, IUSB is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Certain divisional and departmental curricula are additionally accredited by national agencies and organizations pertinent to those areas. (p. 9) The 6,608 student population (1994-95) live primarily within a 50 mile radius of the campus. Basic curriculum is offered on a twelve month basis, allowing students to spread out their academic programs and continue their work schedules. Students matriculate in certificate programs, associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree programs.

Students in the Division of Education at IUSB receive Bachelor of Science degrees in

elementary, secondary, music, and special education. The graduate program consists of Master of Science degrees in elementary, secondary, and special education, and counseling and human services. In addition, the Division of Education offers graduate courses required for standard licensure by the state of Indiana in elementary and secondary school administration and supervision.

South Bend Community School Corporation

The South Bend Community School Corporation is Indiana's fifth largest school district. Serving a student population of 21,500 students in 36 schools, "The primary mission of the South Bend Community School Corporation is to focus all its efforts and resources on meeting the intellectual, creative, emotional, physical and social needs of all its students. Secondarily, all extracurricular and co-curricular activities have a valid and valued position in our Corporation. To this end, the Corporation will insure that every student has a quality education. All students will be provided with programs of enriched learning experiences to enable them to acquire the skills, knowledge, concepts, ideas, and attitudes that will promote their growth as individuals and as contributing members of our society. Recognizing that our students are from varied backgrounds, we will foster intercultural and interracial understanding through these educational programs. The accomplishments of this mission will be enhanced through the cooperative efforts of the schools and the larger community." The corporation maintains five high schools (Grades 9-12), an adult education program, five middle schools (Grades 7,8), twenty-three elementary schools (Grades K or 1 - 6), and three elementary schools (Grades preschool or Kindergarten only). The corporation also has other programs for students, including an Adult Secondary

Credit, Adult Special Education, and School Age Mothers Program. There are approximately 3,200 employees (1,385 of whom are teachers) employed with the South Bend Community School Corporation. The pupil/teacher ratio is 19:1. The General Fund budget (1993-94) of $89,4334,447 supports a per pupil expenditure of $4,176. The student population in the South Bend Community School Corporation is as follows:

White-American	63.1%
African-American	30.2%
Hispanic-American	4.7%
Asian-American	1.5%
Native American	0.5%

Elkhart Community Schools

Elkhart Community Schools is located approximately twenty miles from South Bend in Elkhart, Indiana. The mission of Elkhart Community Schools is that "each school independently will provide a nurturing environment in which all of its students can become productive, thinking and responsible members of society. To achieve this mission, the Corporation not only will support the schools but will involve the entire community in sustaining their efforts." The student enrollment is 11,700 and is served in fifteen elementary schools (Grades K-6), three middle schools (Grades 7,8), two high schools (Grades 9-12) and a career center for high school and adult education students. The school corporation also has Special Education and Adult Education Programs. There are 1,550 employees, 858 of whom are certified (teachers, counselors, administrators, etcetera). The teacher/pupil ratio is 20:1. The General Fund budget (1993-94) of

$45,230,379 supports a per pupil expenditure of $3,914. The student population in Elkhart Community Schools is as follows:

White-American	78.6%
African-American	17.0%
Hispanic-American	3.2%
Asian-American	1.1%
Native-American	0.1%

School City of Mishawaka

The School City of Mishawaka is located in Mishawaka, Indiana, an adjoining community to South Bend. The Mission Statement is "recognizing that education is a lifelong learning process, the School City of Mishawaka will foster a positive learning environment with the community that educates all students to their highest potential to be contributing members of society." The student enrollment is 5,162 for grades Kindergarten through twelve. The district maintains seven elementary schools (Grades K-6), one elementary/junior high school (Grades K-8), one middle school (Grades 7,8), and one high school (Grades 9-12). The school district also has Special Education, Tech Prep, and Gifted/Talented Education programs. There are 577 employees, 383 of whom are certified. The teacher/pupil ratio is 18:1. The General Fund budget (1993-94) of $19,498,586 supports a per pupil expenditure of $3,817. The student population in the School City of Mishawaka is as follows:

White-American	95.5%
African-American	2%

Hispanic-American	1.5%
Asian-American	.5%
Native-American	.5%

Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation

Penn-Harris-Madison is centrally located between the cities of South Bend and Elkhart in northern Indiana. The mission of Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation indicates that "In partnership with the community, we are committed to providing educational experiences that nurture growth, cultivate interests, and develop talents to enable all students to become successful, responsible, lifelong learners in a changing world." The student enrollment is 8,923 and is served in one high school (Grades 9-12), two middle schools (Grades 6-8), and eight elementary schools (Grades K-5). The school corporation also has Special Education programs. There are 835 employees, 457 of whom are teachers, and a pupil teacher ratio of 18:1. The General Fund budget (1993-94) of $33,227,180 supports a per pupil expenditure of $3,370. The student population in the Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation is as follows:

White-American	96%
African-American	1.4%
Hispanic-American	.7%
Asian-American	1.6%
Native-American	.3%

Vision and Rationale in Forming the Collaborative

The concept of a working collaborative was one that became apparent early in the

discussion of changes needed in the school administration preparation program at Indiana University South Bend (IUSB). Although initial discussions on the certification program was held with IUSB and the South Bend and Elkhart Community School Corporation, it quickly expanded when the Mishawaka and Penn-Harris-Madison school corporations expressed an interest in being involved. All four school corporations had a similar concern: the quality of candidates for principalships in North Central Indiana needed to improve. A consolidated effort to address the concern would be more effective than singular initiatives. The four corporations, although in some cases different demographically, faced similar challenges. A viable academic institution in Indiana University South Bend was in close proximity to address the issue of local preparation. Some of the faculty at IUSB consisted of adjunct professors who were practitioners in the local school corporations. What better place to solicit applicants than from within your own geographical area, from persons who have worked in your corporation or surrounding corporations as teachers? The rationale seemed straightforward; prepare local candidates for area principalships. The university was given the challenge of taking the initiative in the change of program. "Indiana's universities must take the leadership and the responsibility; they must be proactive; they must have the vision; they must be committed to the public schools to provide them with their students; and they must take a creative role in meeting the needs of public education." (MacNaughton, personal communication, November 2, 1994) MacNaughton also noted that it is more cost effective for persons aspiring to become principals to receive their training in the Northern area of the state as opposed to traveling to campuses in central and southern Indiana. "Economic and societal needs of today are quite different than years past when

educators were in a better position to travel to central and southern Indiana to pursue advanced degrees and/or certification. Many single heads of household as well as dual working families cannot realistically take sabbaticals, summers on the main campus, nor weekly long distance travel. Some of the best qualified, experienced and creative educators are therefore prevented from aspiring to leadership positions in education merely because of their geographical, economic and family constraints." (1994)

The vision and rationale in forming a collaborative was based on the assumption that a stronger program would evolve through the collaboration of university and school districts. Collaboration, defined as sustained commitment and involvement (Barnett, 1995), would involved both a commitment to the planning of the program, as well as the implementation. Practitioners would be an integral part of the screening of applicants for the cohort, design of the content-including co-teaching, and monitoring of problems of practice experiences. The university would make a commitment by hiring a full-time tenure-track faculty to facilitate the implementation of the program. With the vision and rationale clearly set, the focus centered on the incorporation of specific school corporation needs into the design of the program.

Tailoring A Collaborative Program to Meet Specific Corporation Needs

The establishment of a working collaborative was critical to assessing the needs of area school corporations. It was also key to receiving the cooperation necessary to implement the new principal's certification program. Each of the four school corporations in the collaborative: The South Bend Community School Corporation, the Elkhart Community Schools, the School City of Mishawaka, and the Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation, brought their ideas and needs to

a discussion on the preparation of school leaders and worked to design a program that would include the respective feedback. Initial issues addressed by two of the school corporations included diversity and the shrinking pool of quality candidates. School administrators in the Elkhart Community Schools and the South Bend School Corporation had frequent conversations with IUSB faculty that the principal's certification program was not providing school leaders versed in the realities of the principalship. These school corporations shared with the university that the students being offered as applicants for school principalships had not had experience with diverse student populations. They indicated that they were unprepared to lead schools in North Central Indiana where cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity existed. This phenomena was causing a shrinking pool of quality applicants. Since school corporations do not have the luxury of training applicants on the job, they expect applicants to come ready to accept the challenges of school leadership. Therefore school corporations in North Central Indiana sought applicants for school principals from other geographical areas.

The diversity concerns espoused by Elkhart and South Bend school corporations, were compounded by discussion with Mishawaka and Penn-Harris-Madison school corporations that the overall preparation of students aspiring to be school principals fell short in their exposure to current issues facing school leaders. Practitioners in the working collaborative were convinced that aspiring school principals need to be directly involved in problems facing school administrators by being immersed in the issues and their resolution and placed at school sites. Therefore, the critical features of the new principal's certification program, and those leading to the overall objectives of the program were:

1) To deliver a principal certification program in the state of Indiana which prepares administrators for involvement in an educational environment which is increasingly diverse and multicultural.

2) To expose pre-service as well as inservice administrators to the knowledge and skills required for practicing in a network of many constituencies--teachers, fellow principals, superintendents, school boards, community leaders, professional organizations, and university faculties.

3) To implement a delivery model in which teams of university, working with clinical practitioners or practicing principals, integrate administrative theory with practical application in actual school settings, through a problems of practice teaching approach.

4) To ultimately, to assist school boards in the recruitment and preparation of administrative leaders.

Practitioners were equally convinced that the changes necessary for the effective preparation of school administrators must include them. Their commitment to provide placement sites, modeling, and mentoring to those aspiring to be school principals is a critical component of the new principal's certification program. In addition, their commitment to work with university faculty in developing problems of practice for each of the curriculum areas and to objectively review applicants, and participate in the screening of students is also an integral part of the program.

The tailoring of a collaborative involved active listening to the participants and a

commitment by all interested parties to follow through on the suggestions and recommendations that have been brought forth. It also involved assigning tangible responsibilities to all members of the working collaborative. "After a great deal of discussion, we agreeded that in a true collaborative all of the constituents participated as equals and that outcomes must be the result of compromise and eventual consensus." (Stoeckinger, personal communication, February 10, 1995) With the objectives firmly implanted and the direction of the new program taking form, the next step in the process was the formation of a committee structure to insure that the design of the program take shape.

Formation of the Collaborative Committee Structure

The Division of Education at Indiana University South Bend recognized that the preparation program for students seeking school administration licenses had to change. Many of the deficiencies that were noted in the program had been ones that have been talked about nationally for years. IUSB decided that it was time for action. They therefore sought a grant from the Lilly Endowment Foundation. The incentives for seeking the Lilly grant, as identified by the former project director, included:

1. No lack of candidates for the educational administration certification program.
2. Recent graduates of the program were not given high priority for hiring and promotion within the four school corporations close at hand.
3. At the University, the one full-time program faculty member taught one course in educational administration so that everyone who went through the program worked with this professor in the practicum.

4. All other administration courses were taught by adjunct faculty--recruited from the school corporations.

5. The program was not a program in the conventional sense. It was a series of courses sequentially numbered; the only requirement for content was that the general content of the course be consistent with the catalog description of one or two sentences. (Stoeckinger, 1995)

The School Leadership Project is coordinated by a project director. The primary responsibility of the project director is to facilitate the implementation of the new principal's certification program. This includes the management of the grant, as well as to serve as a liaison with the university to navigate the administrative structure for course approval and programmatic changes.

The governance structure of the working collaborative is divided into three major segments: The Executive Committee, Operations Committee, and the General Assembly. The Executive Committee consists of the superintendents and/or their designee from the four area school corporations who are involved in the School Leadership Project and faculty from Indiana University South Bend. University faculty includes the Dean for the Division of Education, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Director of Middle and Elementary Education, and one of the professors with teaching responsibilities in school administration. The Executive Committee is the decision making body of the working collaborative. It establishes broad policy within which the Operations Committee takes discretionary action. The project director is a non-voting member and serves as chair of the Executive Committee.

The Operations Committee recommends programmatic decisions and oversees the implementation. It is primarily a working group for the program and consist of representatives from IUSB faculty and administrators from each of the four school corporations. It is also chaired by the project director.

The General Assembly consists of all constituents of the collaborative. Its role is to provide input and feedback to the Operations and Executive Committees. This group is scheduled to meet at least once a year.

The working collaborative also consisted of six design teams. Their primary tasks was designing the program and developing the curriculum. Since the new instructional delivery system, emphasizing a problems of practice approach, is the core of the new principal's certification program, a review and revision of curriculum offerings, alignment of curriculum with national direction in school administration, and tailoring the curriculum to meet the challenges facing the principalship was necessary. A supporting grant was approved by Lilly Endowment to develop and implement the proposals for curriculum changes that were recommended by the working collaborative.

Coordination and Editing: Process and Problems

The writing teams were designed to facilitate collaboration with the four school corporations involved in the School Leadership Project. Each team consisted of representatives from the four school corporations and the university faculty. A consultant worked with the coordination and editing of the work done by the writing teams. She observed that the composition of the writing teams had both an up- and a down-side. It was positive to have each

constituency involved in the conceptualization and writing of the program because it resulted in a multi-dimensional outcome for each of the Domains. Also, because the document had to be presented to the General Assembly for approval, consensus-building was a critical factors. "One of the greatest difficulties we faced was to help participants step back from the day-to-day perspectives, values, judgements, etc. associated with their 'day jobs'. We aspired to a delicate balance--the task required their professional wisdom and experience, but just as important was the need to become adept at taking -the-role from a variety of experiential perspectives--colleagues, superintendents, university faculty, community leaders, etc." (Fails, personal communication, February 10, 1995)

The writing teams worked for two and half months. A specific format for the development of course syllabi was not given to the teams. This left them free to design the course the way they chose. The central strand throughout the work of the writing teams was the inclusion of actual site-based situations requiring resolutions.

School Leadership Project: The Curriculum

The curriculum established by the working collaborative was based on 21 Domain structures established by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1993) The design teams reviewed the 21 Domains and consolidated them into four major content areas: Communications and Interpersonal Relations, Knowledge of Teaching and Learning, Community Context, and Leadership and Organization. The six design teams were formulated as follows:

1. A screening and admissions course.
2. An on-going course initiated after admission and continuing throughout the

program, culminating in a portfolio assessment.

3. Domain I: Communications and Interpersonal Relations

4. Domain II: Knowledge of Teaching and Learning

5. Domain III: Community Context

6. Domain IV: Leadership and Organization

Each design team developed the knowledge base and skills necessary for their respective curriculum area. The knowledge and skills were represented in course descriptions, objectives, scope, and a general survey of the literature. Each course is designed to be team taught with university faculty and practitioners with expertise in the respective Domain area.

Orientation to School Administration

The design team representing screening and admissions developed criteria for selection of participants in the cohort. Their discussion led to an orientation course that will include broad content necessary for an introductory course in school administration, as well as self assessment by candidates to the fit between the expectations of school administrators with their personal goals , skills, and attributes. The course will also include an overview of the cohort program and the Domains constituting the core of the content. Practitioners and university faculty will assess the candidates performance in the orientation course, consider their self-assessment, and interview the candidates for admission into the cohort program.

Domain I: Communication and Interpersonal Relations

The communications course was based on the premise that effective educational leaders exhibit positive communication and interpersonal skills. School principals must communicate with

internal and external members of the school community. Effective communication is essential with all constituents in order to facilitate positive interactions. Four types of communication constitutes the content of the course: 1) interpersonal, 2) group, 3) organizational, and 4) public. Central to the study of these communication types will be managing conflict, listening, facilitating, writing, performing under stress, problem solving, motivating, consensus building, negotiating, and conferencing. Also implicit are certain human relations skills including sensitivity to diversity, flexibility, respect for others and their ideas, pragmatism, diplomacy, empowerment, and collegiality. Students will participate in actual school situations to understand the role communication plays in problem identification and resolution.

Domain II: Community Context

This course has three major components: 1) Resources, emphasizing strategies to access community, state and national resources for funding, expertise, and materials; 2) Regulations, emphasizing a working understanding of the legal and political context of schooling and the constraints and opportunities these offer, and 3) Community relations, emphasizing working relationships with the school milieu, and an understanding of and an appreciation for the diversity in the community. Recognizing that a school principal is responsible to the total community and that the total community has a vested interest in schools, the course is guided by principles that include a belief that principals should value community diversity -- ethnic, racial, cultural, socio-economic, family structural, and philosophical -- in building exciting and inclusive learning environments. The course also recognizes that principals should be trained to be proactive resource persons as well as reactive crisis managers.

The Community Context course addresses five overriding problem areas: conflicting values, implementing change, building partnerships, crisis management, and family and child advocacy. These five problem areas are integrated into eight general accomplishments determined by the design team to be crucial to effective problem solving: 1) assessment and evaluation, 2) legal and ethical implications, 3) resources and how to assess resources, 4) accessing resources, 5) political ramifications, 6) encouraging and managing community participation, 7) dissemination and communication, and 8) consensus building.

Domain III: Knowledge of Teaching and Learning

The central purpose of schooling is teaching and learning. School administrators have a primary responsibility to ensure that a comprehensive educational plan, insuring student achievement, is in place. School principals must demonstrate a thorough knowledge of curriculum development, implementation, and assessment. They must be able to see the "big picture" and provide the leadership necessary to maximize student potential.

The Knowledge of Teaching and Learning course involves interpreting and communicating curriculum standards; discussion and application of teaching and learning theory as they relate to the practice of teaching; analyzing student achievement data; supervising/evaluating personnel; commitment to meaningful change and an understanding of its dynamics; coordinating and facilitating on-going staff development; and a commitment to ones own professional development.

Domain IV: Leadership and Organization

The principal's leadership determines a school's effectiveness. This course envisions leadership as neither "manager" nor "boss" (Patterson, 1993). It embraces the concept that

leadership roles must view the administrators as a servant leader, an organizational architect, social architect, and moral educator. (Murphy, 1992) This concept of leadership challenges the traditional views of authoritarian and dictatorial. Espoused is the concept that leaders must be initiators, consider reconciliation as a desired outcome of successful conflict-management, focus on change, know how to network with constituencies and support systems outside of the school, creates a climate which bonds leaders and followers in a commitment to shared beliefs, and values reflection as crucial prerequisite for effective decision-making.

The political, sociological, and psychological aspects of school leadership, contemporary leadership styles, school governance, schools as organization, and the organizational processes and techniques of schools are explored in this course. Issues include evaluation, strategic planning, finance, site-based leadership, use of technology, labor relations, trends in school reform and restructuring, student management, and time management. Leadership and organizational theories and their relationship to the practice of school administration is the focal point.

Problems of Practice

Problems of practice is the central instructional delivery method of the new principal's certification program and is included in each of the content courses. It is an expansion of Edwin Bridges' (Stanford University) problem based learning model (PBL). Problem-based learning is an instructional strategy that has the following characteristics (Bridges & Hallinger, 1992):

1. The starting point for learning is a problem (that is, a stimulus for which an individual lacks a ready response).
2. The problem is one that students are apt to face as future professionals.

3. The knowledge that students are expected to acquire during their professional training is organized around problems rather than the disciplines.

4. Students, individually and collectively, assume a major responsibility for their own instruction and learning.

5. Most of the learning occurs within the context of small groups rather than lectures.

The Stanford model consists of simulated problems that are addressed by students in a classroom setting. Students may engage in presentations to school boards or practitioners in order to make them more realistic, but primarily the intent is to gain experiences through simulated activity. Problem based learning is also an instructional delivery method used in the training of medical professionals, and again, generally takes place in the classroom. Medical students are given case scenarios and asked to respond with an analysis and diagnosis. Problems of practice , on the other hand, is the immersion of students into problems faced by school administrators by placing the students in actual sites to work on these issues with practitioners. It is similar in concept to a program developed by the University of Colorado Denver in which students work with schools in consulting teams to engage in the process of school design, of diagnosing difficulties in a particular school and in constructing and implementing school improvement plans. Problems of practice provides "contextually-real" situations in which students are required to participate in the solution of difficult problems of actual practice. (Murphy, 1994)

Problems of practice provide the catalyst for the changes in the new principal's certification program at Indiana University South Bend. It is central to each one of the major curriculum domains. Students will be engaged in problems related to the respective curriculum content. The

problems will be selected jointly by the practitioner and the university faculty.

Where We Are Now

The School Leadership Project is scheduled to begin in May, 1995. The curriculum, which includes six new courses, has been enthusiastically received throughout the Indiana University campus system. Students enter the School Leadership Project as part of a cohort. Their participation is sequential over a two year period. The expectation is that once beginning the program, a student would continue until completion. The sequence of courses is detailed in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1
School Leadership Project: Sequence of Required Courses for Cohort I

	Summer 1995	Fall 1995	Spring 1995	Fall 1996	Spring 1996
Orientation to School Administration (3 semester credits)	X				
Communications and Interpersonal Relations (3 semester credits)		X			
Community Context (3 semester credits)					X
Knowledge of Teaching and Learning (6 semester credits)			X		
Leadership and Organization (6 semester credits)				X	
Portfolio Assessment					X

Students are also expected to complete a course in school law during the course of the two year period.

The major roadblock at the time of this writing is the acceptance of the self-contained nature

of the program. Because IUSB is a regional campus, changes in programs must receive a remonstrance from area campuses. The core campus would like to maintain system-wide structure to three of the courses they feel are similar in content to existing courses. The rationale is transferability of courses between campuses. The cohort nature of the program, as well as maintaining the integrity of the planning committee's work, dictates the separation of the program from the current principals' certification programs.

The logistics of the problems of practice placements is another issue that is currently being addressed. Indiana University South Bend serves a population of students within a fifty mile radius of the campus. The students who participate in graduate study, and subsequently those who will participate in the new principal's certification program, are primarily teaching during the school day. Therefore, this will be taken into consideration by the Operations Committee and the Program Director as the logistics are worked out for their participation in the program.

Recruitment for the new certification program will formally begin in March, 1995. Letters will be sent to school corporations to solicit participants. In addition, records of students currently in the IUSB data base will be accessed and letters sent. Students will also enter the program by referral from principals and faculty who participated in the planning phase of the project. Participation in the new certification program is limited to 25 students. These students will be selected from those who have completed the orientation course. Potential students began calling the Director for School Administration upon her arrival in July, 1994. It is anticipated that recruitment will not be a problem.

Conclusion

The School Leadership Project is grounded in a belief that universities and school districts can best prepare educational leaders by working together. Collaboration has been a critical component of the IUSB program. From the initial conversations with the four area school corporations to the establishment of the vision, curriculum, and program design, collaboration has been the central focus. The governance structure was designed to promote the collaborative effort and to insure that collaboration is maintained throughout the program.

Programs to prepare educational leaders must change. The reform, restructuring, and challenges in education, public and private, dictate the need for the change. Nationally, E. M. Bridges and Hallinger (1992), J. Murphy (1992, 1993), T. J. Sergiovanni, et. al. (1990, 1995), M. Murphy, R. Muth, M Martin (1994), McCall (1994), et. al. have also advocated a look at administrative preparation programs and their relevance to the practice of educational leadership. The National Policy Board for Educational Administration, looking at standards for curriculum for the preparation of educational leaders, support the need to assess current preparation programs. Educational leaders will no longer have the luxury of learning while on the job. This "shoot from the hip" model cannot meet the complexities practitioners now face in leading today's schools. Aspiring practitioners must be prepared by being immersed in real school situations. These cooperative efforts enhance the likelihood of quality candidates versed with a credible knowledge base, as well as persons who will meet district needs.

The IUSB model is one response to the request for change in the preparation of educational leaders. It offers the dynamics of collaboration, along with the design and structure to make it among the cutting edge in school leadership preparation. The curriculum was developed using

the guidelines of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1993) and incorporates their proposed NCATE curriculum guidelines (August 1994). The four Domains - Communications and Interpersonal Relations, Community Context, Knowledge of Teaching and Learning, and Leadership and Organization - represent the current thinking in educational administrative preparation program. The problems of practice delivery methods links the knowledge base to the realities of the principalship. While the School Leadership Project is just beginning the implementation stage, it offers some opportunities to the growing movement of reform in the preparation of school administrators. The remaining challenge will include maintaining the integrity of the collaboration that has occurs with the four school corporations and the university while navigating and innovative program through traditional university structures.

References

Barnett, B.G. (1995) Visioning for the future: What can educational leaders do to build shared commitment to interagency collaboration? Journal of School Leadership. January, 1995. Vol. 5:1 pp. 69-86.

Bridges, E. M. & Hallinger, P. (1992). Problem based learning for administrators. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC.

Edmonds, R. (1980, June). Search for effective schools. Paper presented at the Strategies for Urban School Improvement Workshop Series, Washington, D. C.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy. 28-32.

Fredericks, J. & Brown, S. (1993). School effectiveness and principal productivity. NASSP Bulletin, 77, 9-16.

Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., and Forsyth, P. B., (Eds.) (1988). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Hannaway, J. & Talbert, J. (1993). Bringing context into effective school research: Urban-suburban differences. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 164-86.

Institute for Research on Teaching. (1983). An overview of school improvement programs. [Program Description]. East Lansing, MI: Ron Edmonds.

Lazotte, L. & Jacoby, B. (1991). Effective schools: Practices that work. Effective Schools Products.

McCall, J. (1994). The principal's edge. Princeton Junction, NJ: Eye on Education.

Murphy, J. Ed. (1993). Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative Designs. University Park, PA: UCEA, Inc.

Murphy, J. (1992). The landscape of leadership preparation. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. & Louis, K. S. (1994). Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, M. (1994, August). Goal 2000: A personal research agenda. Paper presented for the 48th Annual Summer Conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational

Administration, Indian Wells, CA.

Murphy, M., Sanders, N. M., Muth, R., Martin, W. M. (1994, August). Rigor in administrative preparation: The enduring dialectic. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference on Professors of Educational Administration, Indian Wells, CA.

Muth, R., Murphy, M. J., Martin, W. M., & Sanders, N. (1994, October). Assessing knowledge and skills through portfolios. Symposium presentation on Problem-based Learning, Performance Standards, and Portfolios at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Philadelphia, PA.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1993). Principals for our changing schools: The knowledge and skills base. Fairfax, Virginia: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Patterson, J. L. (1993). Leadership for tomorrow's schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Smith-Stuart, C. & Piele, P. K., (Eds.). (1989). School leadership handbook for excellence (2nd ed.). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.